United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPENDIX

74-15-50 74-1550

IN THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

NO. 74-1550

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

-against-

CARMINE TRAMUNTI, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS' JOINT APPENDIX Vol. T(39) - Pages 5381 to 5422

HERBERT SIEGAL Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Carmine Tramunti 17 John Street New York, New York 10038 RE 2-5330

NANCY ROSNER Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Louis Inglese 401 Broadway New York, New York 10013 925-8844

PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

.

IVAN S. FISHER
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Donato Christiano
401 Broadway
New York, New York 10013
925-5937

ROBERT L. ELLIS Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Angelo Mamone 17 East 63rd Street New York, New York 10021 838-2323

FRANK A. LOPEZ
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Joseph DiNapoli
31 Smith Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
237-9500

THEODORE ROSENBERG Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Frank Pugliese 31 Smith Street Brooklyn, New York 11201 858-0589

KENNETH E. WARNER
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Joseph Ceriale
875 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10001
244-4444

ROBERT FISKE
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
John Gamba
One Chase Mannattan Plaza
New York, New York 10005
422-3400

GEORGE DAVID ROSENBAUM
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Vincent D'Amico
51 Chambers Street
New York, New York 10007
BE 3-8120

MICHAEL C. DOWD Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Frank Russo 120-10 Queens Boulevard Kew Gardens, New York 11415 793-2900

ROBERT LEIGHTON
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Warren C. Robinson
15 Park Row
New York, New York 10038
267-6016

GARY SUNDEN
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
William Alonzo
401 Broadway
New York, New York 10013
925-4848

EDWARD PANZER
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Hattie Ware
299 Broadway
New York, New York 10007
349-6123

MARTIN JAY SIEGAL Attorney for Defendant-Appellant John Springer 250 West 57th Street New York, New York 10019 586-1414

HARRY POLLAK Attorney for Defendant-Appellant Henry Salley 299 Broadway New York, New York 10007 BE 3-0386 jhal

UNITED STATES OF MURICA

vs.

CARMINE TRAMUNEI, et al.

New York, March 10, 1974, 10:45 a.m.

Deliberations resumed.

"Your Ronor, I don't cuite know how to put
this but may I ask if we are not allowed to speak to
alternates or discuss present case is it not also
wrong for a juror to write data from that said case.

I know we were told no magazines, playing cards and such,
which would distract our mind from what we are here for,
but this person is copying data from the said indictment on a pad in her purse. I have spoken to her about
it because I feel I am responsible since the marshal
says I am responsible for the papers. I just have a
fear of leakage before we reach a verdict. So
please acquaint the jury with what they should not do
over again and I suggest her pad be confiscated, cuietly.

"Thanking you, I remain, No. 1 Juror, Forelady

Hare."

3

(In open court.)

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, Mr. Dowd and Mr. Pusso are not here.

MR. LEIGHTON: Mr. Dowd is here.

THE COURT: Bring him back, will you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Pollak is not here

either.

I think you all recognize that THE COURT: we have an extremely conscientious jury. At least, I believe so, the way they read the exhibits, each and every one spending a lot of time doing it, the way they looked at everything.

I received a note this morning from one of I will mark the note as a court's exhibit, the jurors. but I intend to do absolutely nothing about it right now.

I think you recall in semi-jest when we first were selecting the jury I made a comment -- I am not even sure that I made it on the record or I made it to the total jury panel or I just made it to some people as I was excusing them -- that they had missed the great opportunity as they were being excused to write the great American novel and what it is like to be sequestere

Apparently some juror has made some notes In other words, they looked at from the indictment.

25

ir

1.

the indictment, wrote down a couple of things.

The indictment is a public document that they can get at any time. Another juror says (a) she can't do that or he can't do that. I can't tell one way or the other. It is quite obvious that they can.

I don't think it is necessary to bring the jury out here and tell them, "You can't take notes, you can't wrote about what is in the indictment." They are there, they have the indictment in front of them.

Of course they can take notes.

You recall at the beginning of the case one juror asked whether she could take notes and I said no, I didn't want anybody taking notes. What we have ehre is a situation where another juror feels that this continues on into the deliberations.

MRS. ROSNER: Your Honor, may I hear the note read in open court?

THE COURT: Yes, I will read it.

MRS. ROSNER: I would suggest, your Honor, that we need not bring the jury out, but your Honor can express your feelings concerning the permissibility of the juror's behavior in a note which the marshals can carry into the jury.

MR. PHILLIPS: Before we do anything, let's

hear the note.

MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, perhaps it would be appropriate though to remind the jury that the indictment is only a charge.

THE COURT: All right. Let me read you the note.

"Your Honor, I don't quite knew how to put
this, but may I ask if we are not allowed to speak to
alternates or discuss present case is it not also
wrong for a juror to write date from that said case.

I know we were told no magazines, playing cards
and such, which would district our minds from what we are
here for, but this person is copying data from the said
indictment on a pad in her purse. I have spoken to her
about it because I feel I am responsible since the
marshal says I am responsible for the papers. I just
have a fear of leakage before we reach a verdict. So
please acquaint the jury with what they shouldn't do
over again and I suggest her pad be confiscated quietly.

"Thanking you, I remain, No. 1 Juror Forelady Hare."

Yes, Mr. King.

MR. KING: Your Honor, I have something that I would like to bring to your attention which I

1 jha

deem of extreme importance.

THE COURT: Has it got to do with this note?

MR. KING: It has nothing to do with the note.

THE COURT: Hold on. Let's work on this note.

MR. DOWD: I just have a question which maybe you should ponder.

Obviously if this is taking place in deliberations it is a totally different matter, which I suspect from the reading is exactly the case.

The only question I have -- I don't think it is worth bringing the jury out and interrogating them about it -- do you think by any means that note means prior to deliberations.

THE COURT: No. She didn't have the indictment prior so how could it be prior to deliberations.

The suggestion has been made that I send a note back to No. 1 Juror, Forelady Hare, which I am willing to do, and I will see if I can draft up something and get everybody to agree to it. However, it is almost impossible to get everybody to agree to anything here.

MRS. ROSNER: Your Honor, I would suggest you

4 5

8 9

let defense counsel read the exhibit and sit down together and try to frame what we would agree would be an appropriate answer and at least get agreement among all defense counsel.

THE COURT: If you can get agreement among all defense counsel, !lrs. Rosner, you are a magician.

But if you can that is fine by me.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, if the note just said no note-taking is permissible during deliberations --

THE COURT: Why don't you read it and see what you can do.

MR. PANZER: It is not clear from that note whether she is taking the notes back to the motel at night. Maybe that is what the problem is. Certainly they can take notes while they are deliberating. When they are through deliberating, I think that is when the problem arises.

MR. LOPEZ: Judge Duffy, may I suggest that the government declare its position.

MR. CURRAN: Your Honor, as far as I can tell from what your Honor read, I think it's pretty simple.

I think it's pretty simple. I think they should be told they can take notes while they are deliberating and not while they are not deliberating.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor might further explain to them that your direction with respect to taking notes at the beginning of the trial related to the evidence.

I think there is also something in that note that requires answering and that is whether or not they can talk to the alternates.

THE COURT: Absolutely not. The alternates have been completely segregated. They don't even go to the same restaurant.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, my suggestion was that you answer the question, which is "Can we talk to the alternates?"

THE COURT: No. It is a statement, "We are not allowed to speak to the alternates or discuss present case."

The alternates have not been near the jury at all. I have been very strict about that. You might know we have a bus to transport the jury back and forth, but I have hired a separate limousine to carry the alternates. As I said, I sent them to different restaurants. How much more can I do?

They are at a different part of the hotel.

They are not permitted to pass that guard post outside

of the jury area in the hotel.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

Mr. Clerk, mark this as a court's exhibit.

Ladies and gentlemen of the defense, I suggest you take a crack at writing the note, see what you can do.

> (Court's Exhibit 81 marked for identifiction.)

MR. KING: Yesterday, if your Honor please, was the first opportunity I had to see the transcript of March 7th. They were brought down yesterday. In going over it last night I was quite disturbed to run across the following, and I ask your Honor to please bear with me. This is extracted from 'Ir. Curran's summation on page 5051, and I quote:

"Sinatra, do you remember Sinatra, John Gamba, the defendant here, the stash man? You heard about him from Pannirello and you heard about him from John Barnaba.

"Did John Barnaba lie about that transaction, the involvement of Sinatra, again? He simply testified that at the going away party the night before Butch Puglies went to jail Pugliese came up to him and asked him what he, Barnaba, thought of using Sinatra, Gamba, as a stash man in connection with this other operation that Pugliese had going with Barnaba, and Barnaba simply said, 'I

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't know. "

5052: "But doesn't that corroborate what we learn from Pannirello, who had been arrested by the federal authorties? John Barnaba's testimony."

Three on 5053: "Then you have the testimony of Jimmy Provitera," and dropping towards the end of that paragraph the simple sentence: "Again, Sinatra's hosue, Gamba's house."

Now, that is in : Curran's summation and here is what Barnaba actually said on pages 1460 and -61, line 15:

"Q Who was present?

"A There was myself, Joe Sharp, Frank Sinatra, Harry, Patty was there. That's about it.

"Q Butch Pugliese was there?

"A Yes.

*Q During that get-together did you have a conversation with Butch Pugliese?

*A Yes. He asked me what I thought of Frank Sinatra as a stash?

"Q As a stash?

"A Yes."

1461:

"O What did that mean to you?

.

e

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Somebody to hold goods for. "A

What did you say to that question?" And this is what I am talking about, Judge.

I says I didn't know Sinatra that "A well, 'You probably know him better than me. There's nothing I can tell you about him. "

If your Honor please, this is a deliberate cropping of a statement made by a man in the same way that they cropped photos in the McCarthy hearing.

THE COURT: Oh, wait a second. Wait a second.

If you compare it, the man MR. KING: simply said, "I don't know." There is a vast amount of difference between "I don't know" and the actual statement "I don't even know the man."

That is not the actual statement MR. CURRAN: That is a deliberate distortion MR. KING: to the jury and I think the jury even at this late stage -it's important enough, Judge -- should be corrected on what it was that Barnaba said.

MR. CURRAN: Your Honor, in the first place, I did not say -- ..

MR. KING: Excuse me, Mr. Curran. not finished.

Monor.

2

MR. CURRAN: I am sorry. Excuse me, your

3

1

MR. KING: Then on page 5140 Mr. Curran stated:

7

8

9

10

5

"Well, ladies and gentlemen, as the United States attorney for this district I have a great obligation to and esteem for my client. My client is the United States. I want to leave you with the knowledge that that obligation is one to which I am firmly committed.

11 12

13

14

"Ladies and gentlemen, we have an obligation to justice. That is my obligation, it is Mr. Phillips', Mr. Fortuin's, Mr. Engel's, in this case and in every case."

15 16

17

18

19

20

In other words, he laid the prestige of the United States attorney of this district and his assistants and the United States Government on the line after deliberately cropping a statement that was made, and it is as plain as the nose on his face, and I say that it is important enough at this point that the jury be disabused of what he said.

21 22

23

THE COURT: I don't think so. If that is a motion, Mr. King, the motion is denied.

24

Let me know when you have a draft ready, !Irs.

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24 25 iha

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Rosner.

(Recess.)

(In open court.)

I understand that all defense THE COURT: counsel have agreed to me sending a note back to the forelady which reads:

"Madam Forelady, I have received your note. I wish to instruct the jury that it is perfectly permissible for any member of the jury to take notes to aid him or herself during deliberations. As I have repeatedly instructed you, the indictment is not evidence of any kind but it does set forth the various accusations and a juror may find it useful to make notes on it."

> Is that agreeable to every defense counsel? MR. POLLAK: Yes.

All right. THE COURT: I have a carbon It will be marked the next court's exhibit. copy.

> (Court's Exhibit 82 was marked for identification.) -

I got another note from the THE COURT: jury:

"Your Honor, is it possible to hear testimony regarding a particular count along with the defense without hearing unrelated testimony?

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Thank you, Madam Forelady."

The answer is yes, but they have to specify what they want. I can't give an answer to it, really. For example, if the question is can we hear the testimony relating to count 1 we are in tough shape. We are going to sit here another five weeks and listen to the court reporter read it all back.

MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, I would suggest that the answer to that question, recognizing the difficulty, has to be yes, because if we answer it no or we qualify it in any way we are going to dissuade them from asking for testimony when they might be in doubt. think that would just have to be our job, to decide what does pertain to the individual counts.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, what I had suggested to the defense attorneys this morning is that each of them have ready the pages, for instance, on a specific count. I think the answer to that question would be, for instance, if they want to hear testimony on count 8, that the government submit -- these are substantive counts -- that the government submit what pages they think are appropriate as far as count 8 is concerned or count 21 and the defense submit that, and then of course your Honor is the ultimate judge of what

pages should be read. So that an affirmative answer can be given to this.

Of course, all this applies to the substantive count. Count 1 is just impossible, unless they want to hear the whole record.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Just one problem with what

Mr. Lopez is saying, however, and that is in certain

aspects of cross examination that could be redundant.

Some of my cross examination as well as some of co
counsel's cross examination did not go into areas covered

by other counsel. For instance, with Mr. Stasi, there

may be six or eight of us that were interested in

certain aspects of his testimony. Mr. Fisher,

Mrs. Rosner, Mr. Siegal, may have crossed on certain things

I didn't want to do, and vice versa, but relied upon the

jury remembering that cross examination.

If I may give your Honor an example -- maybe an example would not be in order at this time.

THE COURT: I understand the problem.

However, let's answer yes and let's ask them to specify what count they want and let's see what we can do about working it out. Is everybody agreed to that?

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, I think I agree

jha 5395

with Mr. Ellis, that the basic answer to the jury's inquiry ought to be yes. I would also suggest to your Honor to consider what your Honor suggested that the jury be told that they can specify in any particulars that they want, whatever testimony that they want to hear, and I also suggest that your Honor might want to consider saying to the jury that once they start listening to whatever testimony they have requested if they wish to not hear any further they may so indicate.

MR. ELLIS: No, your Honor.

MR. LOPEZ: NO.

THE COURT: That is much too dangerous.

Then they are going to jump and say, "I don't want to hear the cross."

I recognize everybody is laughing, but it is a possibility, and I don't want to take that chance.

MR. WARNER: Your Honor, one probably I foresee, although I agree, of course, with the answer, is that in certain instances a specific transaction was not specifically accounted for or defended, it was simply part of a general attack on credibility. I think that problem can be dealt with as each question comes in.

THE COURT: Let's handle it when we see the specifics.

MR. PANZER: Judge, could we get an idea of what time you are going to send the jury out?

THE COURT: They are not going to lunch.

MR. PANZER: What time would we be able to go out to lunch?

THE COURT: Let me send this note back.

Let's see if we get a note back from them right away.

Then we will decide.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I propose to do is send back a note to the jury which reads:

"Madam Forelady, in response to our note regarding testimony on a 'particular count along with the defense without hearing unrelated testimony,' the answer is yes."

That is simple enough. Anyone object to

The record should reflect that I am greeted with a thunderous silence.

(Court's Exhibits 83 and 84 were marked for identification.)

THE COURT: I am sorry to hold you here,
but I did not have a carbon paper and I wanted to recopy
the note which I am sending to the jury. That has
been marked as a court's exhibit, Court's Exhibit 84.

hear?

fication.)

23

24

25

MR. DOWD: Does it say who they want to

THE COURT: No. Mr. Lopez, I will call

upon you to speak. What is your reaction? 2 MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, frankly speaking, 3 I don't think they are entitled to hear either summations for the prosecution or the defense. I don't think that is the evidence in the case. However, your Honor 7 in his discretion can permit them to hear my summation. MR. SUNDEN: Judge, I would like the 9 record to reflect that I am of a completely contrary 10 opinion. 11 MR. FISHER: Your Honor, my position is 12 that they are entitled to hear anything that probably 13 occurred in front of them during this case, including 14 The only question here I think is which summations. 15 specifically do they want. 16 THE COURT: They haven't indicated. 17 MR. EPSTEIN: The defendant Tramunti would submit that whatever was in open court properly 18 19 before the jury during the course of this trial can be re-20 read to the jury if the jury so requests during the course 21 of their deliberations. 22 THE COURT: Is that the consensus, with the 23 exception of Mr. Lopez? 24 MR. LOPEZ: No, I will agree to that.

THE COURT:

Hr. Phillips, how do you feel

about it?

7 8

MR. PHILLIPS: We agree, your Honor.

THE COURT: I just hope they don't want me to read back the entire charge.

MR. ELLIS: Judge, I would object to reading the summations to the jury. I am not sure this is a legal argument as distinguished from an argument addressed to your Honor's discretion. The government did devote an extraordinary time to the defendant Hamone. We have made certain requests of your Honor with respect to Mamone, particularly portions of the charge relating to the activities at the Beach Rose Social Club, which your Honor denied.

I summed up in the expectation that you would have a complete, balanced presentation of the evidence in your marshaling and I think that I would suggest as an alternative that we read the relevant evidence to the jury with respect to whatever defendant they are inquiring about rather than arguments of counsel.

MR. LOPEZ: Judge Duffy, I think that the consensus of opinion among defense counsel -- they can correct me if I am wrong -- is that the jury is entitled to hear any portion of what appears on the record. If they want to hear portions of Mr. Curran's summation,

that is fine; if they want to hear any specific summation, that is fine too. Let them hear what they have already heard. Certainly that can do no harm.

MR. ELLIS: | Judge, I would object to reading the portion of the government's summation, for example, that cloaks itself with the American flag. There were portions of the charge and portions of the summations that we regard as objectionable and we don't want to compound the error by reading it twice.

THE COURT: All right. I propose to send back the following note:

"To the jury: You may rehear any portion of what is already on the record, including the summations of the prosecuting and defense attorneys. • But you should know that these are merely arguments of advocates. You may rehear any portion of the charge, including portions of my attempt at summarizing the evidence, but you should realize that my summarizing the evidence is not evidence.

"Of course, if you want to hear any portion of the testimony reread that will be done."

Does anyone object to it?

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor.

MR. FISHER: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the phrasing tends to dissuade them perhaps from 2 their obvious desire to hear some of the summations and 3 I think it tends to suggest perhaps that they ought to go 4 back to the testimony, which apparently is not their desire. 5 I think the note could be answered very succinctly, as 6 your Honor has done once before: yes. 7 8

MR. LOPEZ: I agree.

MRS. ROSHER: No objection to that, your lionor.

MR. ELLIS: I would object to that, very, very strongly, your Honor.

MR. SUNDEN: Judge, I would object to the part of your note that alludes to rereading of your marshaling.

THE COURT: That is what they asked.

MR. SUNDEN: I didn't hear that.

THE COURT: ". . . and/or your Honor's charge regarding a particular incident."

MR. SUNDEN: I see. I would just like to state for the record that I know your Honor gave a blanket exception to the marshaling of the facts -- your Honor was fatigued that day and I didn't want to unduly articulate exceptions thereto, but I very strongly join in the exceptions as articulated by Mr. Rosenberg.

| 2 | I would, I guess at this point, object to any |
|----|--|
| 3 | procedure that would have the effect of remouthing that |
| 4 | marshaling of the facts, which I consider prejudicial to |
| 5 | Alonzo, to the jury. |
| 6 | MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, may I say that I |
| 7 | believe that a majority of defense counsel here present |
| 8 | in behalf of all defendants agree with Mr. Fisher, and |
| 9 | I would ask defense counsel who agree with Mr. Fisher to |
| 10 | stand up. |
| 11 | THE COURT: All right. |
| 12 | MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, this is not a mat- |
| 13 | ter of majority vote. |
| 14 | |
| | THE COURT: No, no. What we are trying |
| 15 | to do is find out who objects. |
| 16 | Those who agree stand up. |
| 17 | Mr. Dowd, you object to it. |
| 18 | MR. DOWD: I have a qualified yes. |
| 19 | MR. LOPEZ: Then sit half way up. |
| 20 | THE COURT: He has an objection to that too. |
| 21 | Mr. Ellis, you object. |
| 22 | MR.ELLIS: Yes. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | and the wife clot is sitting. |
| - | I gather you are standing up for both of you? |

Yes, that's right.

MR. EPSTEIN:

1

4

6

8

10

11

12

13 14

. 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, it was perfectly evidence yesterday during the reading of the testimony that a majority of the jurors reacted adversely to the prolonged reading and I think it is fair to say at this point, in view of their note, that they are looking for some way to avoid a repetition of yesterday's prolonged reading. I believe they are trying to boil this case down to the nutshell of hearing the arguments of A and the arguments of B and choosing between the two, and any note or any kind of communication from the court that doesn't remind the jurors that their primary obligation is to decide this case on the evidence if their recollection is imperfect or requires refreshment is grossly prejudicial, at least to Mamone, who was emphasized to an extraordinary degree in the summations, far out of proportion to his importance on the record.

THE COURT: All right. I intend to send back to the jury the note which I read to you.

I am going to have that Xeroxed and have it marked as a court's exhibit. It will be the next court's exhibit, which is 86.

MR. FISHER: Your Honor, would you read the last part of that again?

MRS. ROSNER: Would you read the whole answer

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

is.

jha

again.

thing?

THE COURT: You want me to read the whole

5405

MRS. ROSNER: Yes.

"To the Jury: You may re-THE COURT: hear any portion of what is already on the record, including the summations of the prosecuting and defense attorneys, but you should know that these are merely arguments of advocates.

"You may rehear any portion of the charge, including the portions of my attempt at summarizing the evidence, but you should realize that my summarizing of the evidence is not evidence.

"Of course, if you want to hear any portion of the testimony reread that will be done."

MR. FISHER: If your Honor, please, would your Honor consider removing the word "merely" in front of "arguments" of defense counsel. I don't think arguments of defense counsel should be relegated, your Honor. I think they are pretty important to the defense as well as the government. Other than that we spent a week doing something merely.

THE COURT: I will let it say the way it

21

22

23

24

25

XX

iha

5406

(At 5:45 p.m. a note was received from the jury.)

(In open court.)

(Court's Exhibit 87 was marked for identification.)

MR. FISHER: Your Honor, while we are waiting for the government could I put on the record the application I made?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. FISHER: If your Honor please, at 5:22, on behalf of all the defendants in this case, I asked the court to send a note into the jury stating that the jury may consider the arguments of counsel together with the record in the case and I was advised by your Honor's chambers that that application was denied.

THE COURT: That's right.

We have received another note from the jury which has been marked as Court's Exhibit 87 for identification. The note reads:

"To Judge Duffy: We would like to hear testimony regarding Joseph DiNapoli in count 21 of December, 1971."

Signed "Madam Forelady."

Count 21 reads:

"The grand jury further charges in or about

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

Take a look at

THE COURT: All right.

25

MR. FISHER: Your Honor, I renew the application I made with regard to the summations of counsel and I would ask the court at some appropriate, prior to or after the reading of the testimony to advise the jury that summations of counsel may be considered together with the record in the case.

I remind the court we were asked, the court was asked, whether or not it was permissible to have the summations read. The court then responded summations are merely argument of counsel, and I think quite naturally there was no subsequent request for any reading of the summations. I think perhaps, your Honor, most respectfully, the court might have inadvertently suggested to the jury that summations of the defense or any counsel were to be denigrated with respect to the record, which I don't think is an appropriate charge. I think perhaps the court might be able to correct some of that by at least at this point so advising them.

THE COURT: No. I wrote that note with a full understanding of what I believe summations of counsel should be considered, of course. I am not going to change it at this point. The application is denied.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, Mr. Lopez cited pages 2530 through 2574 as bearing on the delivery of narcotics by DiNapoli or on the distribution by DiNapoli in December of 1971. That part of the record that Mr. Lopez cited to you encompassed his entire cross examination of Mr. Pannirello.

We would submit that the only portion of his cross examination of Mr. Pinnirello that related to the distribution by DiNapoli in December of 1971 as charged in count 21 appears at the top of page 2568 and goes for approximately several pages after that, to the bottom of page 2570.

We agree with Mr. Hopez' citation with respect to the direct examination of Mr. Pannirello as it touched upon the charge of DiNapoli distributing narcotics as contained in count 21, but as far as the rest of Mr. Lopez' cross examination is concerned it in no way touched upon the distribution by DiNapoli as charged in count 21 of the indictment.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I think -- are you finished, Mr. Phillips?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: I think that credibility here is very much in issue and certainly page 2530 goes to

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14'

15

16

17

18

19

30

21 22

23

24

25

the issue of credibility and I think that we are concerned with that in considering the reliability of the testimony, and that is why I am making the point as far as 2530. I would like to --

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, if we get into credibility then everything that corroborated Harry Pannirello should be gone into as well, the testimony regarding the million dollars should be read to the jury, the testimony of Mr. Barnaba as it corroborated Harry Pannirello, the testimony of Dawson and Provitera as it corroborated Harry Pannirello should also be read, if we are going to into credibility, your Honor.

MR. LOPEZ: There is a point here in the cross examination that goes into identification, and there is also the point here where Pannirello indicates --I am looking for the page now, your Honor, if I just may have a moment --

> THE COURT: Sure.

MR. PHILLIPS: All that the jury asked for, your Honor, as I understand the note, was the testimony that related to count 21, which charges DiNapoli in or about December, 1971 with distributing two kilograms of heroin.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, with regard to

| 1 | jha 5411 |
|----|--|
| 2 | count 21, I think the identification is important and |
| 3 | I certainly feel that all the testimony should be read |
| 4 | but in addition to the pages that Mr. Phillips cited |
| 5 | certainly pages 2548, 2549 |
| 6 | THE COURT: Hold it. Let me get to it, |
| 7 | please. |
| 8 | MR. LOPEZ: That would be 2548, starting |
| 9 | from the bottom of the page: |
| 10 | "Q Let's go to DiNapoli. |
| 11 | "Did you ever in your whole life, you, ever |
| 12 | receive a package in any quantity of narcotic drugs |
| 13 | from Joseph DiNapoli? |
| 14 | "A No, not me." |
| 15 | I think that definitely has a bearing on |
| 16 | count 21. |
| 17 | THE COURT: On 2549. |
| 18 | MR. LOPEZ: Yes, that whole page. |
| 19 | THE COURT: All right. 2548 and 2549. |
| 20 | MR. LOPEZ: What were those other pages, |
| 21 | 2568, 2569. |
| 22 | . MR. PHILLIPS: 2568 through the bottom |
| 23 | of 2570, through line 21 of page 2570. |
| 24 | THE COURT: All right. And the identi- |
| 25 | fication testimony, that is located exactly where? |

| 1 | jha 5412 |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. LOPEZ: The identification testimony, |
| 3 | your Honor |
| 4 | MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, we object to |
| 5 | any identification testimony because that is clearly |
| 6 | not what the jury is asking for. |
| 7 | THE COURT: I heard you. |
| 8 | MR. LOPEZ: That would be, your Honor |
| 9 | THE COURT: All right. I gather from |
| 10 | the bottom of 2535. |
| 11 | MR. LOPEZ: Right. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Is that right? |
| 13 | MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor. |
| 14 | THE COURT: That is line 15 to where? |
| 15 | MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, if the identifi- |
| 16 | cation is going to be read we would ask that Agent |
| 17 | Nolan's testimony regarding Mr. Pannirello's prior out- |
| 18 | of-court identification of Mr. DiNapoli also be read. |
| 19 | MR. LOPEZ: That has no bearing on this |
| 20 | issue. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Let me get Mr. Lopez' requests |
| 22 | first. Sit down. I will hearyou out later. |
| 23 | MR. LOPEZ: That would be to page 2543, |
| 24 | line 14. |
| 25 | THE COURT: All right. Now I will |

2

3

4

5 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

hear you, Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: If your Honor is going to consider having the jury listen to the testimony regarding the identification of Mr. DiNapoli the government would ask that the redirect of Mr. Pannirello regarding the identification of Mr. DiNapoli be read as well as the testimony of Agent Nolan that touched upon the prior out-of-court identification by Mr. DiNapoli be read as well as the testimony of Agent Nolan that touched upon the prior out-of-court identification by Mr. Pannirello of Mr. DiNapoli.

THE COURT: All right. I will think about it. Right now I made arrangements for the jury to leave here to be at the restaurant at 6:30. going to read this testimony that you are asking me to read and I will rule on it as soon as we get back. Let's be back by 7:30.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, may I just make one last request?

> THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: As a matter of fact, I would encourage that in view of the fact that the cross examination of Pannirello was short by myself, I would encourage that all of it be read, and if the government then wishes

(Dinner recess.)

THE COURT: All right. 7:30 be back.

24

25

1

EVENING SESSION

3

5

6

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(8:00 p.m.)

(In the robing room.)

THE COURT: Mrs. Rosner, Mr. Curran, before I walked out of the building, after I told the marshals to take the jury to dinner, they handed the marshal a note, which I will read in great length outside. It involves basically both of you. It involves time profitably to find out what they want.

"We would like to hear the testimony regarding count 14 on Mr. Louis Inglese which occurred on or about the month of February, 1971.

"Also we would like to hear the testimony regarding count 28 on Mr. Louis Inglese which occurred on or about the month of May, 1973.

"We are requesting the preparation of the above material but we do not wish the material read in Nor do we wish the above read in successuccession. sion with the previously requested material.

"Sincerely, Madam Forelady."

(Court's Exhibit 88 was marked for identification.)

(Discussion off the record.)

1

Z

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

(In open court.)

THE COURT: You recall we had a note marked 87, Court's Exhibit 87 for identification, which read:

"We would like to hear the testimony regarding Joseph DiNapoli in count 21 of December, 1971," signed "Madam Forelady."

On that, I intend to permit only the specific items which relate to count 21 to be read.

Mr. Lopez, I assume that you object.

MR. LQPEZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: My ruling will stand.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: My ruling will stand.

MR. LOPEZ: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Court's Exhibit 88 marked for identification is a note which reads -- this I received immediately just before I walked out of the building.

"Dear Judge Duffy: We would like to hear the testimony regarding count 14 on Mr. Louis Inglese which occurred on or about the month of February, 1971.

"Also we would like to hear the testimony regarding count 28 on Mr. Louis Inglese which occurred on or about the month of May, '73.

"We are requesting preparation of the above

1

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

"Madam Fourlady. Thanks."

(Court's Exhibit 90 was marked for identification.)

THE COURT: What I intended to do is to have the jury back, read the testimony regarding Joseph DiNapoli and count 21. Then I am going to tell them to go back, since they did not want it read in succession, and as soon as they want the next thing read we will read that to them. Then they go back, come out again the third time, and after they do that hopefully we will be able to collect the Ben Tolopka exhibits. I guess, Mr. Richman, you have yours.

MR. RICHMAN: I have all of them, your Honor, except for one item which the government has.

THE COURT: All right. They will go in after the three readings of testimony, and by that time maybe we can agree as to what statements, exhibits, or evidence relating to Richard Forbrick is.

I have set out for the court reporter the sections which are to be read in connection with the count 21 request.

Bring back the jury.

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am

24

25

| 1 | 21. |
|------|--|
| | jha 5420 |
| 2 | (The jury left the courtroom at 8:55 p.m.) |
| 3 | THE COURT: All right, Mr. King. |
| 4 | MR. KING: I just feel that any reference |
| 5 | that the reporter made to Mr. Gamba your Honor should |
| . 6 | have instructed the jury to disregard. Thepur |
| 7 | of this rereading had only to do with DiNapoli. It |
| 8 | had nothing to do with Mr. Gamba. Now they have |
| 9 | heard for about the second or third time about his being |
| 10 | a stash. I think it has been unduly emphasized and |
| 11 | unfairly and to his prejudice. |
| 12 | THE COURT: All right. I assume that |
| 13 | is a motion. The motion is denied. |
| 14 . | |
| 15 | Mrs.Rosner, why don't we go inside and |
| | see whether we can work this out. |
| 16 | MRS. ROSNER: Your Honor do you have a full |
| 17 | copy of the transcript inside. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Not a full copy. The parts, I |
| 19 | think, that belong. We will get the rest of them. |
| 20 | MR. ELLIS: Your Honor, I believe there |
| 21 | may be references to Mamone. |
| 22 | (In the robing room) |

(In the robing room.)

(Discussion off the record.)

(A discussion was held in the robing room in connection with Court's Exhibit No. 88, the request

u

of the jury to hear testimony regarding count 14 on Mr. Louis Inglese, also on count 28.

In connection with both counts, Mrs. Rosner requested that she be permitted to read the entire cross examination of the witness involved. That request has been denied.

In connection with count 14, the government has requested that the testimony to be read on direct be that of Mr. Barnaba from page 1422 through 1427, line 8.

Mr. Ellis and Mrs. Rosner suggest that the direct be terminated on page 1425 and Mr. Ellis particularly requested that the direct be terminated on line 16 on page 1425.

I have at this time not made any determination as to that request.

On the cross examination we have agreed that with my limiting ruling on the other counts the cross examination will be limited to page 1682, lines 1 to 15.

MRS. ROSNER: May the record reflect that apart from the request to read the whole cross there was a lesser included request to read 1694, line 18, to 1696, line 2, which was also denied.

-

14 .

jury.)

(In open court.)

THE COURT: I have a note from the jury.)

THE COURT: I have a note from the jury which does not need to be included as a court record unless somebody would like it to be. I gather they are tired, they would like to go. I gather that all of you are tired also. Ten o'clock tomorrow.

(At 10:15 a note was received from the

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, could we make it an hour later. It takes me an hour and a half to get home today.

THE COURT: It takes me an hour and a half too. Ten o'clock tomorrow.

(Adjourned to 10:00 a.m., March 11, 1974.)